

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/627,387	07/25/2003	Antonio Barrero Ripoll	1410/72895	3921	
22242 7	590 09/09/2004		EXAMINER		
	TABIN AND FLAT	YEUNG, GEORGE CHAN PUI			
	A SALLE STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406			1761	THE EXTREME	
22.201100, 12					
				DATE MAII FD: 09/09/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/627,387	RIPOLL ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		George C Yeung	1761				
Ti Period for R	he MAILING DATE of this communication ap eply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE MAI  - Extension after SIX (  - If the perio  - If NO perio  - Failure to Any reply	TENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL LING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. s of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.16) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. od for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replot for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute received by the Office later than three months after the mailin tent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely, the mailing date of this con D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.			
Status							
1) Re:	sponsive to communication(s) filed on	•					
		action is non-final.					
3)☐ Sin	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
clo	sed in accordance with the practice under $m{\it E}$	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition	of Claims						
4)⊠ Cla	im(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application						
	Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra						
5) <u></u> Cla							
6)⊠ Cla	im(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.						
7) <u></u> Cla	im(s) is/are objected to.						
8)∏ Cla	im(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.	1				
Application	Papers						
9) <u></u> The	specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Арр	licant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Rep	lacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFF	R 1.121(d).			
11) The	oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTC	)-152.			
Priority unde	er 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)⊠ A 1.⊑ 2.⊑ 3.⊠	=	s have been received. s have been received in Applicationity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National S	tage			
Attachment(s)							
2) ☐ Notice of E 3) ⊠ Information	References Cited (PTO-892) Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) In Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) S)/Mail Date 7/25/2003.	4) Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te	52)			

Application/Control Number: 10/627,387

Art Unit: 1761

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Objections

The phrase "improved or functional" recited in claims 7-14, line 1 of each, is superfluous and it should be deleted.

### Claim rejections-35 USC§ 112

Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention for the following reasons:

- 1. The phrase "can be" recited in claims 1 and 8, line 15 each, is indefinite.
- 2. There is no antecedent basis for "the gas or vacuum" as recited in claim 1, line 19.
- 3. The term "when" recited in claims 3-6, line 3 of each, is conditional and futuristic and thus it is not a positive limitation.

## Claim rejection-35 USC§ 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 7, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by Ganan-Calvo (U.S. Patent 6,248,378).

Application/Control Number: 10/627,387

Art Unit: 1761

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8, 10, 11, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Ganan-Calvo (U.S. Patent 6,248,378). Ganan-Calvo shows the product set forth in claims 8, 10, 11, 13 and 14. Alternatively, it is not seen that the claims define an unobvious new product over the product of Ganan-Calvo. The Examiner's position is that irrespective of the process by which the product is made, the claimed product is still a food product having encapsulated particles; and such a product is shown by Ganan-Calvo. It is well settled that the recitation that the product is made by a new process, if the process was indeed new and patentable, does not impart patentability to an otherwise unpatentable product. The burden is upon the applicants to come forward with evidence to prove that the prior art product does not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of the claimed product. See In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685; In re Pilkington, 162 USPQ 145; In re Fessman, 180 USPQ 324 (especially 325, last para.); In re Marosi, 710 F.2d 799, 218 USPQ 195 (Fed. Cir. 1983); and In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Art Unit: 1761

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-6 are free of the prior art. Claims 1-6 would be allowable if amended to

overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 set forth in this Office action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to George C. Yeung whose telephone number is (571)

272-1412. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10:30 AM to

7:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

G. C. Yeung/af September 2, 2004

GEORGE C. YEUNG

PRIMARY EXAMINER